

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 PRADYUMNA KUMAR SAMAL,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. CR18-0214JLR

ORDER

15 The court enters the following non-sealed order in response to Defendant's
16 supplemental motion for allocation of funds for forensic accountant. (Supp. Mot. (Dkt.
17 # 68).)

18 In his earlier motion for allocation of funds for forensic accountant (Mot. (Dkt.
19 # 63)), Defendant sought an order allocating \$20,000.00 for completion of forensic
20 accounting services he allegedly could no longer afford. (*See generally* Mot. (Dkt.
21 # 63).) The court granted in part and denied in part the motion. (Order (Dkt. # 64).)

1 Defendant's supplemental motion is as misguided as Defendant's original motion.
2 The only justification for the supplemental motion is that the accountant has finished her
3 work. Without a material change in the facts, Defendant's supplemental motion is
4 actually nothing more than a disguised motion for reconsideration.

5 Defendant's supplemental motion is DENIED. Defendant's lawyers, Ms. Emma
6 Scanlan (WSBA #37835) and Mr. Craig Suffian (WASD #52697) are cautioned that their
7 conduct is perilously close to sanctionable.

8 Dated this RD23 day of August, 2019.


JAMES L. ROBART
United States District Judge